

1 DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
2 United States Attorney  
3 District of Nevada  
4 BLAINE T. WELSH  
5 Assistant United States Attorney  
6 Nevada Bar. No. 4790  
7 333 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 5000  
8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101  
9 Phone: (702) 388-6336  
10 Facsimile: (702) 388-6787  
11 Email: Blaine.Welsh@usdoj.gov

12 DAVID SHONKA  
13 Principal Deputy General Counsel  
14 NIKHIL SINGHVI  
15 JASON D. SCHALL  
16 HELEN P. WONG  
17 IOANA RUSU  
18 LaSHAWN M. JOHNSON  
19 COURTNEY A. ESTEP  
20 Federal Trade Commission  
21 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
22 Mailstop NJ-3158  
23 Washington, D.C. 20580  
24 Phone: (202) 326-3480 (Singhvi)  
25 Facsimile: (202) 326-3629  
26 Email: [nsinghvi@ftc.gov](mailto:nsinghvi@ftc.gov) (Singhvi); [jschall@ftc.gov](mailto:jschall@ftc.gov) (Schall)  
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission

17  
18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
19 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

20 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

21 Case No. 2:12-cv-536

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 AMG Services, Inc. et al.,

25 Defendants, and

26 Park 269 LLC, et al.,

27 Relief Defendants.

28 **PLAINTIFF FEDERAL TRADE  
COMMISSION'S SUPPLEMENT  
TO MOTION TO UNSEAL (#560)**

1 Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission (“FTC” or “Commission”) filed a Motion To Unseal And File  
2 Redacted Memoranda And Exhibits In Connection With Summary Judgment Motions (Docket No. 560)  
3 (“Unseal Motion”), as well as a sealed Reply In Support Of Its Unseal Motion (Docket No. 573). The  
4 Court granted the FTC’s Unseal Motion in part (Docket No. 576), unsealing the FTC’s memoranda,  
5 declarations, appendix, and most exhibits in the manner proposed by the FTC. The Court did not unseal  
6 Exhibits 94 and 98, but permitted the FTC to file a supplement to its Unseal Motion reflecting its  
7 proposed redactions to these exhibits. (*Id.*)

8 The FTC now requests that the Court:

- 9 1. Unseal redacted versions of Exhibits 94 and 98, as proposed by the FTC in Exhibits 94-R and  
10 98-R to this supplement; and
- 11 2. Unseal the FTC’s Reply In Support of Its Unseal Motion (Docket No. 573) without redactions.

12 **1. The Court Should Unseal Exhibits 94 And 98 With The Redactions Proposed By The FTC**

13 Exhibit 94 to the FTC’s Summary Judgment Motion contains training notes for one of Defendants’  
14 employees. This exhibit has been redacted for all information not specifically discussed and referenced in  
15 the FTC’s summary judgment memoranda and appendix, and for all identifying information of the  
16 employee in question. The non-redacted portions of this exhibit cannot reasonably be characterized as  
17 trade secrets. Moreover, the Court has already unsealed similar training notes (Exs. 93R, 101R, 102R,  
18 104R, 176R, 177R, 180R), with the redactions proposed by the FTC. (Docket No. 576 at 2.) The Court  
19 should unseal Exhibit 94 as proposed by the FTC in Exhibit 94-R to this motion supplement.

20 Exhibit 98 to the FTC’s Summary Judgment Motion contains meeting minutes from one of  
21 Defendants’ team meetings. This exhibit has been redacted for all information not specifically discussed  
22 and referenced in the FTC’s summary judgment memoranda and appendix. The non-redacted portions of  
23 this exhibit cannot reasonably be characterized as trade secrets. Moreover, Defendants have already  
24 agreed to (and the Court has granted) the FTC’s request to unseal other, similar meeting minutes (Exs. 51-  
25 R, 52-R, 53-R, 54-R, 55-R, 59-R, 64-R, 65-R, 67-R, 69-R, 70-R), with the redactions proposed by the

1 FTC. (Docket No. 576 at 2.) The Court should unseal Exhibit 98 as proposed by the FTC in Exhibit 98-R  
2 to this motion supplement.

3 **2. The Court Should Unseal The FTC's Reply In Support Of Its Unseal Motion (# 573)**

4 Portions of the FTC's reply memorandum to its Unseal Motion quote from or paraphrase portions  
5 of documents that Defendants have designated as confidential and that Defendants have argued should  
6 remain sealed. As a result, the FTC filed its reply memorandum under seal solely in order to avoid  
7 publication of the disputed materials until the Court resolved the parties' confidentiality dispute. (Docket  
8 No. 574.) Because the Court has now resolved this dispute and granted the FTC's motion to unseal and  
9 file redacted versions of all documents quoted or paraphrased in the FTC's reply memorandum (Docket  
10 No. 576), the Court should also unseal the FTC's Reply In Support Of Its Unseal Motion (Docket No.  
11 573). This memorandum cannot be reasonably characterized as containing trade secrets, and Defendants  
12 have not presented compelling reasons to maintain the information quoted or paraphrased in this  
13 document under seal. A copy of the FTC's reply memorandum is attached to this motion at Attachment  
14 A.

15  
16 THEREFORE, this Court should unseal Exhibits 94 and 98 in the manner reflected in Exhibits 94-R and  
17 98-R, attached to this motion, and should further unseal the FTC's Reply In Support of Its Unseal Motion  
18 (Docket No. 573) with no redactions.

19  
20 Dated: April 16, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 /s/ *Ioana Rusu*  
Nikhil Singhvi  
Jason D. Schall  
Helen P. Wong  
Ioana Rusu  
LaShawn M. Johnson  
Courtney A. Estep

*Attorneys for Plaintiff  
Federal Trade Commission*

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Ioana Rusu, certify that, as indicated below, all parties were served via electronic case filing with **PLAINTIFF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S SUPPLEMENT TO ITS MOTION TO UNSEAL (#560)** filed with the Court. The Attachment and Exhibits to the motion will be sent to lead counsel via email.

Dated: April 16, 2014

/s/ *Ioana Rusu*  
Ioana Rusu

Joshua M. Dickey (jdickey@baileykennedy.com)  
*Attorney for Red Cedar Services, Inc. dba 500FastCash; SFS, Inc. dba OneClickCash*

Conly J. Schulte (censchulte@ndnlaw.com)  
Francis J. Nyhan (jnyhan@ndnlaw.com)  
Nicole Ducheneaux (nducheneaux@ndnlaw.com)  
*Attorneys for Defendants AMG Services, Inc.; Red Cedar Services, Inc. dba 500FastCash; SFS, Inc. dba OneClickCash; MNE Services, Inc. dba Tribal Financial Services, Ameriloan, UnitedCashLoans, USFastCash*

David J. Merrill (david@djmerrillpc.com)  
Debra K. Lefler (debra.lefler@kirkland.com)  
Bradley Weidenhammer (bweidenhammer@kirkland.com)  
Charles Kalil (ckalil@kirkland.com)  
Richard Howell (rhowell@kirkland.com)  
Peter J. Wozniak (peter.wozniak@kirkland.com)  
Andrew A. Kassof (andrew.kassof@kirkland.com)  
*Attorneys for Defendants AMG Services, Inc. and MNE Services, Inc. dba Tribal Financial Services, Ameriloan, UnitedCashLoans, USFastCash*

Von S. Heinz (vheinz@lrrlaw.com)  
Darren J. Lemieux (dlemieux@lrrlaw.com)  
E. Leif Reid (lreid@lrrlaw.com)  
Jeffrey D. Morris (jmorris@berkowitzoliver.com)  
Ryan C. Hudson (rhudson@berkowitzoliver.com)  
Nick J. Kurt (nkurt@berkowitzoliver.com)  
*Attorneys for Defendants AMG Capital Management, LLC; Level 5 Motorsports, LLC; LeadFlash Consulting, LLC; Black Creek Capital Corporation; Broadmoor Capital Partners, LLC; Scott A. Tucker; Blaine A. Tucker*

1 L. Christopher Rose (lcr@juww.com)  
2 Michael R. Ernst (mre@juww.com)  
3 *Attorneys for Defendants The Muir Law Firm, LLC and Timothy J. Muir*

4  
5 Jay Young (jay@h2law.com)  
6 *Attorney for Defendant for Robert D. Campbell*

7 Paul C. Ray (paulcraylaw@aol.com)  
8 Alyssa D. Campbell (acampbell@laic-law.com)  
9 *Attorneys for Defendant Troy L. Littleaxe*

10 Patrick J. Reilly (preilly@hollandhart.com)  
11 Linda C. McFee (lmcfee@mcdowellrice.com)  
12 Robert Peter Smith (petesmith@mcdowellrice.com)  
13 *Attorneys for Relief Defendants Kim C. Tucker and Park 269 LLC*

14 Brian R. Reeve (breeve@swlaw.com)  
15 Nathan F. Garrett (ngarrett@gravesgarrett.com)  
16 Whitney P. Strack (pstrack@gravesgarrett.com)  
17 *Attorneys for Defendant Don E. Brady*

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28